7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

spectric, and are usually due to some such fact as the death of the father in his son's infancy. After she is married, a woman continues to be known by her own and her father's names, but if she is asked to give a family name, she will give her husband's rather than her father's, family name (cf. Granqvist, 1950, p. 39).

The minimal lineages, then, are name groups. Each lineage name identifies its various bearers as members of a common descent group who are, *ipso facto*, relatives. When pressed, everyone who was asked admitted that he was also related to all the members of his maximal lineage, "and of course *all* of us in Mansūf return (*nirjiʿ*) to Manṣūr Jurjis al-Khūrī." Of these two wider connections, the latter, wider one seemed to be the stronger. In fact, many young adults were quite vague as to the maximal lineage affiliation of many of the minimal lineages. To put the matter in another way, it appears that in many cases a stronger identification is felt with the village as a kin group than with the maximal lineages. Even here, the writer would suggest that the sense of village identification is based possibly more on the interests of common residence than on the kinship bond of common descent from a very remote ancestor. At this point, the possibility must be raised that common descent from Manṣūr Jurjis al-Khūrī and the various descent patterns indicated in Table 8 and Figure 5 are partially or wholly fictional. As it is, it can be seen that the ultimate descent of Minimal Lineages XX and XXI are unknown or in dispute. But if it is fiction, it is nonetheless a significant symbol of the conceptual unity of the village, a conception which is put in terms of kinship. A basically similar concept is held by the people of Ramallah in regard to their genealogical origins (Zenner, 1953, p. 432).

Returning to the minimal lineages, we have seen that they identify by name people who are considered to be relatives. Several people said that the only relatives "who count" are the members of one's minimal lineage. In addition to this, however, matrilateral first cousins appear to count about equally as relatives. Discussion of this exception to patrilineal emphasis must be postponed till later in this chapter.

If, for our immediate purposes, lineage-mates are the only relatives who count, what do they count for? In a negative function, lineage-mates are people who should not marry each other. There is no strict rule about this, and marriages within minimal lineages do occur. They are, in fact, significantly numerous in lineage VIII, which is by far the largest lineage in the village (see Table 10). Having said this much, it must nevertheless be emphasized that marriages within a minimal lineage appear to be avoided in general. They could be much more frequent than they are without violation of the definite rule against the marriage of first cousins. In a positive function, lineage-mates may inherit from each other, whereas matrilateral relatives, no matter how close they may be, can never do so.

It cannot be said definitely that the minimal lineages have any more functions than those which have just been outlined. There are, apparently, no lineage heads, and if lineages ever act as units on any issue, no such behavior was observed or re-

7: Gulick E-S (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

592 if they must live together. So you see, if they *all* lived together in one house, it would be a terrible thing." Later, it appeared that the two technically extended families in the village were looked upon as temporary arrangements. As a residence unit, then, the extended family is absent from Munqif in the theory of the villagers themselves, and it is very exceptional in practice.

596 This does not mean, however, that we can dismiss the possibility of the power of extended families *as social units* regardless of residence. In fact, considering the violent stresses and strains which the common residence of in-laws is believed to cause, it is reasonable to suppose that an extended family living in separate conjugal groups might be a *stronger* social unit than an extended family living under one roof. As a matter of fact, by way of comparison, among the sedentary Bedawin living around Aleppo, several generations of one family never live together under one roof (Dagbestani, 1932, p. 188), yet it is safe to assume that among these people strong extended families as social units are the rule.

BROTHERS

593 There are, indeed, some indications in Munqif of in-group mechanisms extending beyond the conjugal family, but not, in this particular context, inclusive of the minimal lineage. These are all cases of the close relationship between adult brothers, most of whose fathers are dead or so old that they have made over their property to their sons. Note has already been made of the two pairs of brothers who live together as pairs in the summer, but live separately in the winter. In addition, there are three pairs of brothers each of which lives under one roof. These are listed as six independent households in Table 1 because they are so regarded by the villagers. In all cases the shared houses have been partitioned down the middle inside, and thus the families live independently of each other. We thus have five pairs of a total of ten conjugal families, each pair of which shares, in one way or another, a single house. In every case, these situations have arisen because the brothers have not yet "divided their inheritance," as the villagers say. Inheritance patterns will be discussed later; here it is enough to point out that inheritance is equal among brothers. Ideally, one brother—often the youngest—gets the family house, with consequent adjustments in the settlement of the rest of the property. The final settlement is often delayed several years—but never permanently—with results that have just been discussed (see Tannous, 1942, pp. 232–34 for a discussion of the solidarity of close kin).

593 615 621 There are several more cases of brothers who own and occupy adjoining houses, or houses very close to each other. This is considered a "nice" arrangement, but it is often impossible, and there are many exceptions. Projected over many generations, however, this ideal has resulted in the tendency for the houses of maximal lineage mates to have remained clustered together (see map, Fig. 6) after the original division of the village territory among the three sons of the founder.

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

582 588 The term "incest" is most meaningful when it is restricted to the denotation of the mating and/or marriage of relatives so close that knowledge of the act excites horror and revulsion among the other members of the community to such a degree that the guilty pair may be disgraced, ostracized or even killed. On this definition, the marriage of first cousins in Munşif is *not* incest. This is indicated by the status of the two pairs of first cousin spouses now living in the village. As far as could be observed, they suffer in no way because of their special relationship, not even from mild ridicule. The fact *was* singled out for remark as being unusual, against the formal rules, and therefore requiring an episcopal dispensation, but this was all.

582 606 Nevertheless, the marriage of first cousins is restricted, and though not absolutely impossible, difficulties are put in the way of its achievement, and it is rare. In terms of this restriction all first cousins are of equal and undifferentiated status. It is the guess of this writer that (1) the concept of all first cousins being equally close relatives in terms of affective relationships, and (2) the extension of the kinship term *ǧadr* to the male spouses of all first cousins are developments from the pseudo-sibling status of all first cousins which the Church marriage rules established. These three elements of behavior are not in accord with what we would expect to find in a strictly patrilineal system. However, in regard to inheritance and other rights and privileges associated with lineage membership, patrilateral parallel cousins alone have special status, and none of the other types of first cousin count at all. It is important to note that the importance of matrilateral kin is limited to first cousins and their parents, especially the mother's brothers.

Such is the "compromise" between Church regulations and kinship rules as reflected in the various types of behavior associated with first cousins. The theory is admittedly speculative, but in the absence of a better alternative, it is the only interpretation which this writer can give the variously inconsistent phenomena which have been discussed.

RULES OF INHERITANCE

● 428 The rules of inheritance are relevant to the subject of kinship and marriage. Preferably, inheritance among the Arabs goes from father to children. According to Koranic and Ottoman law, all sons receive equal shares, and all daughters receive equal shares, but a daughter's share is equal to half a son's. As the villagers say: "One son is worth two daughters."

In Munşif, however, daughters customarily do not take their shares, but, instead, make them over to their brothers. Zarour (1953, p. 437) reports exactly the same practice in contemporary Ramallah. Several informants of both sexes said that this was not an unfair arrangement because most brothers give their sisters substantial presents when they are married. Since daughters do not, in actual practice, ordinarily inherit property, their marriage to members of other kin groups does not contribute to any dispersal of family property.

585

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

Women in general, however, can and do inherit property in their own right. For example, a widow, even if she has children, gets one-eighth of her husband's property, and if there are no children at all, she gets one-fourth. If there are daughters but no sons, the daughters inherit, in equal shares, a total of fourteen twenty-fourths of their father's property, while seven twenty-fourths go to his brother or brothers. There appears, nevertheless, to be a tendency for such heiresses to make over their inheritance to men of one status or another, or at least to relinquish all responsibility for it. For example, one house in the village was reported to be owned jointly by two men who were not close relatives at all. By marriage, however, they were *'adiil*, married to sisters, and these women, who had no brothers, had inherited the house from their father.

For purposes of inheritance, a man's property is theoretically divided into twenty-four equal parts, on which basis the shares of various heirs can automatically be computed. One can imagine, however, the difficulties and disagreements which arise in trying to divide what is mostly real property, rather than money, into twenty-four equal parts. These difficulties are one reason for the frequent postponement of the actual division of inheritance among brothers.

GODPARENTS

It has been mentioned that godparenthood establishes a ritual siblingship in the second generation. Ordinarily the *sbbiin* at the wedding becomes the godfather (*'arraab*) of the children, while the *sbbiini* becomes their godmother (*'arraaba*). Between the godchildren (masc., *falyuun;* fem., *falyuuni*) and the children of their godparents marriage is forbidden, as between siblings, and sometimes they use sibling terms. However, in actual practice, this prohiibtion does not greatly widen the range of persons with whom marriage is forbidden because many of the brides and grooms select their own brothers or sisters to be *sbbiin* and *sbbiini*. Consequently, in these cases the children are first cousins. In this culture, the godparent complex is largely a means of reinforcing the solidarity of an already solid group of kinsmen. Most informants did not seem to take these ritual statuses, as such, very seriously.

VILLAGE ENDOGAMY AND EXOGAMY

We now turn to the important topic of village endogamy and exogamy. No one is remembered to have married outside the village or the Qurni (marriages within the Qurni are to be considered as locally endogamous) before about one hundred years ago. It has been mentioned before that most of the early cases were men who took wives from villages in which they were doing wage labor. These cases were apparently sporadic and had little or no effect on the social structure of the village since the wives were absorbed into it.

Table 11 indicates that village exogamy did not become a real trend until